

REMARKS

The following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated September 26, 2003. Claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 21-23, 26, 32, and 35-37 are pending in this application with claims 35-37 added and claims 2, 4-9, 12-17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27-31, 33, and 34 cancelled by the present Amendment. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9-13, 16-18, 26-27, 29-30, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 5, 8, 14-15, 19-25, 28, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 21-23, 26, 32, and 35-37 are presented for reconsideration.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9-13, 16-18, 26-27, 29-30, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Taya (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,214). In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that this reference teaches each and every element of the claimed invention. This rejection as to claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 27, 29-30, and 34 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 10-11, 18, 26, and 32.

In Taya, a bit phase adjustment circuit adjusts the delay quantity of a data signal based on a judgment result signal from a synchronous pattern detector circuit, whereby the phase difference of data signal and a clock signal is adjusted. The Office Action asserted that FIG. 12 of Taya corresponds to "a delay circuit" and FIG. 13B corresponds to "a switch".

Taya discloses a structure where “a signal input terminal is connected to the first of serially-connected delay elements 11a-11n and output sides of the delay elements 11a-11n are connected to the switches 12a-12n, respectively.” (column 9, lines 32-35). The switch selects one of the serially-connected delay elements 11a-11n so that “one of outputs from the delay elements 11a-11n provided to the buffer 15 through the corresponding switch” (column 9, lines 37-39) and a selected one is outputted. FIG 13B of Taya corresponds to “the switch” to which a transistor for receiving “the selection signal” and a transistor for receiving “output from the delay element” are connected in the series.

Taya, however, fails to teach and/or suggest that the delayed input signal is propagated to each gate of the first and second transistors via the selecting section means. Therefore in Taya, signal noise is propagated through capacitance between a gate and a drain or a gate and a source of a transistor. In contrast, the recited selection means can cut out or reduce some of this signal noise.

Thus, Taya fails to teach and/or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Taya fails to teach and/or suggest that the delayed input signal is propagated to each gate of the first and second transistors via the selecting section_means. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 10-11, 18, 26, and 32. under 35 USC §102(b).

35 USC §103(a)

Claims 5, 8, 14-15, 19-25, 28, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taya. In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that

these claims are either taught or suggested by Taya. This rejection has been rendered moot as to claims 5, 8, 14-15, 19-20, 24-25, 28, 31, and 33 by the cancellation of these claims. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection as to claims 21-23.

As discussed in detail above, Taya fails to teach and/or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Taya fails to teach and/or suggest that the delayed input signal is propagated to each gate of the first and second transistors via the selecting section means. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a).

New Claims

Claims 35-37 are added to further claim Applicants' invention. These claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion


Applicants' amendments and remarks have clearly overcome the objection and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated September 26, 2003. Applicants' remarks have distinguished claims 1, 10-11, 18, 26, and 32 from Taya and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 USC §102(b). Applicants' remarks have also distinguished claims 21-23 from Taya and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 USC §103(a). New claims 35-37 are added to further claim Applicants' invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 21-23, 26, 32, and 35-37 are in condition for

allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 21-23, 26, 32, and 35-37.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees, which may be required with respect to this paper or credit any overpayment to Counsel's Deposit Account 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 024016-00012.

Respectfully submitted,



Rustan J. Hill
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz:tdd